# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

CHAIRMAN: Judge Wm. Terrell Hodges United States District Court Middle District of Florida MEMBERS: Judge John F. Keenan United States District Court Southern District of New York

Judge D. Lowell Jensen United States District Court Northern District of California

Judge J. Frederick Motz United States District Court District of Maryland Judge Robert L. Miller, Jr. United States District Court Northern District of Indiana

Judge Kathryn H. Vratil United States District Court District of Kansas

Judge David R. Hansen United States Court of Appeals Eighth Circuit **DIRECT REPLY TO:** 

Page 1 of 32

Michael J. Beck Clerk of the Panel One Columbus Circle, NE Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building Room G-255, North Lobby Washington, D.C. 20002

Telephone: [202] 502-2800 Fax: [202] 502-2888

http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov

August 11, 2005

#### NOTICE OF HEARING SESSION

#### Dear Counsel:

Pursuant to the order of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation filed today, you are hereby notified that a hearing session has been scheduled to consider various matters pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

DATE OF HEARING SESSION:

September 29, 2005

LOCATION OF HEARING SESSION:

United States Courthouse Courtroom No. 1, Third Floor

100 Otis Street

Asheville, North Carolina 28801

TIME OF HEARING SESSION: In those matters designated for oral argument, counsel presenting oral argument must be present at 8:30 a.m. in order for the Panel to allocate the amount of time for oral argument. Oral argument will commence at 9:30 a.m.

Please direct your attention to the enclosed Hearing Session Order and Schedule of Matters for Hearing Session for a listing of the matters scheduled for consideration at this hearing session.

- Section A of this Schedule lists the matters designated for oral argument.
- Section B of this Schedule lists the matters that the Panel has determined to consider without oral argument, pursuant to Rule 16.1(c), R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 439 (2001).

For those matters listed on Section A of the Schedule, the enclosed blue "Notice of Presentation or Waiver of Oral Argument" must be returned to this office no later than September 12, 2005. Note the procedures governing Panel oral argument which are outlined on the enclosed "Procedures for Oral Argument before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation." These procedures are strictly adhered to and your cooperation is appreciated.

Very truly,

Michael J. Beck Clerk of the Panel

JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION FILED

**AUGUST 11, 2005** 

MICHAEL J. BECK CLERK OF THE PANEL

## BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

WM. TERRELL HODGES, CHAIRMAN, JOHN F. KEENAN, D. LOWELL JENSEN, J. FREDERICK MOTZ, ROBERT L. MILLER, JR., KATHRYN H. VRATIL AND DAVID R. HANSEN, JUDGES OF THE PANEL

## **HEARING SESSION ORDER**

IT IS ORDERED that on September 29, 2005, a hearing session will be held in Asheville, North Carolina, to consider the matters on the attached Schedule under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that at said hearing session the Panel may, on its own initiative, consider transfer of any or all of the actions in those matters to any district or districts.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that at said hearing session the matters listed on Section A of the attached Schedule shall be designated for oral argument.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that at said hearing session the matters listed on Section B of the attached Schedule shall be considered without oral argument, pursuant to Rule 16.1(c), R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 439 (2001). The Panel reserves the prerogative, on any basis including submissions of parties pursuant to Panel Rule 16.1(b), to issue a subsequent notice designating any of those matters for oral argument.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation shall direct notice of this hearing session to counsel for all parties involved in the matters on the attached Schedule.

FOR THE PANEL:

Wm. Terrell Hodges Chairman

Succeeted

# SCHEDULE OF MATTERS FOR HEARING SESSION September 29, 2005 -- Asheville, North Carolina

## SECTION A MATTERS DESIGNATED FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

## MDL-1334 -- In re Managed Care Litigation

Motions of defendants PacifiCare Health Systems, Inc.; UnitedHealthcare, Inc.; and UnitedHealth Group Inc. for remand, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a), of their respective following actions to their respective transferor courts:

## Southern District of Florida

Leonard J. Klay, M.D. v. PacifiCare Health Systems, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:01-83 (N.D. California, C.A. No. 3:00-1890)

California Medical Association v. Blue Cross of California, et al., C.A. No. 1:01-84 (N.D. California, C.A. No. 3:00-1894)

Charles B. Shane, M.D., et al. v. Humana, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:00-2830 (W.D. Kentucky, C.A. No. 3:00-53)

## MDL-1704 -- In re M3Power Razor System Marketing & Sales Practices Litigation

Motion of plaintiff Kevin Windom for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts:

#### Central District of California

David Atkins v. The Gillette Co., C.A. No. 2:05-4024

## District of Massachusetts

Mark Dearman, et al. v. The Gillette Co., C.A. No. 1:05-11177 Kevin Windom v. The Gillette Co., C.A. No. 1:05-11207

p. 2

## MDL-1705 -- In re Xybernaut Corp. Securities Litigation

Motion of plaintiffs Don R. Heilman, Simona Zuccarelli, and Dean Lawthers for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia:

#### District of Delaware

Robert H. Aylor, Jr. v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-222 Moshe Tal v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-242 Michael Fehrenbacher v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-256 Jeffrey M. Jaskol, et al. v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-268 Joseph Daniel Wauhop v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-310 Christina W. Donnelly, et al. v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-334

## Eastern District of Virginia

Don R. Heilman v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-525 Simona Zuccarelli v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-610 Dean Lawthers v. Xybernaut Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-617

## MDL-1706 -- In re Doral Financial Corp. Securities Litigation

Motion of plaintiff Deerfield Beach Non-Uniformed Municipal Employees Retirement Plan for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico:

#### Southern District of New York

James Finn v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4014
Harold Faverman v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4026
Bruce Simons v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4047
Marc D. Grobler v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4077
Galaxy Electronics Corp. v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4087
Carlton Orchinik v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4098
Ben Bernie v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4113
Thanh D. Vu v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4141
Michael Faith v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4233

p. 3

MDL-1706 (Continued)

## Southern District of New York (Continued)

Samuel Borger v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4250 Andrew Lapat v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4294 Allen Scheiner v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4413 Bruce M. Barich v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4973 Michael Janicek v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-5212 Gueorgui Gagov v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-5213

#### District of Puerto Rico

Deerfield Beach Non-Uniformed Municipal Employees Retirement Plan v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-1430 Carlos Garcia-Flores v. Doral Financial Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-1464

#### MDL-1707 -- Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation Patent Litigation

Motion of plaintiffs Intel Corporation; Dell, Inc.; and Hewlett-Packard Company for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

#### Northern District of California

Intel Corp., et al. v. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation,
C.A. No. 3:05-1886
Microsoft Corp., et al. v. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research
Organisation, C.A. No. 4:05-1894

# Eastern District of Texas

Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation v. Buffalo Technology (USA), Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-53

p. 4

## MDL-1708 -- In re Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litigation

Motion of plaintiff Darci L. Munson for centralization of certain of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota and motion of plaintiff John Brennan for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana:

#### Central District of California

Joseph Gabriele v. Guidant Corp., C.A. No. 5:05-487

#### Southern District of Florida

Eugene Clasby v. Guidant Corp., C.A. No. 1:05-21485

#### Southern District of Indiana

John Brennan v. Guidant Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-827

#### District of Minnesota

Edith Walker v. Guidant Corp., C.A. No. 0:05-1141 Darci L. Munson v. Guidant Corp., et al., C.A. No. 0:05-1153

#### Eastern District of New York

Larry Wenig, et al. v. Guidant Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2822

p. 5

## MDL-1709 -- In re Funeral Casket Antitrust Litigation

Motion of defendants Hillenbrand Industries, Inc., and Batesville Casket Company, Inc., for centralization of certain of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas and motion of plaintiff Pioneer Valley Casket Co., Inc., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

### Northern District of California

Funeral Consumers Alliance, Inc., et al. v. Service Corp. International, et al., C.A. No. 3:05-1804

Francis H. Rocha v. Service Corp. International, et al., C.A. No. 3:05-2501 Marsha Berger v. Service Corp. International, et al., C.A. No. 3:05-2502 Pioneer Valley Casket Co., Inc. v. Service Corp. International, et al., C.A. No. 3:05-2806

#### Eastern District of Tennessee

Ralph L. Fancher v. Service Corp. International, et al., C.A. No. 2:05-145

## MDL-1711 -- In re Midland Credit Management, Inc., Debt Collection Practices Litigation

Motion of defendant Midland Credit Management, Inc., for centralization of the following actions in a single United States district court:

#### Northern District of Illinois

Phillip Jackson, et al. v. Midland Credit Management, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-5056 Esperanza Achamire, et al. v. Midland Credit Management, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-6744

Noah Downs, Jr. v. Midland Credit Management, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-724

#### Northern District of Indiana

Boris Stavroff v. Midland Credit Management, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-127

p. 6

MDL-1711 (Continued)

## Southern District of Indiana

Angela T. Hubbard v. Midland Credit Management, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-216 Christian M. Cline v. Midland Credit Management, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-794

# MDL-1712 -- In re American Investors Life Insurance Co. Annuity Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation

Motion of defendants American Investors Life Insurance Company, Inc.; Creative Marketing International Corporation; AmerUs Annuity Group Company; AmerUs Life Insurance Company; and AmerUs Group Company for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

## Central District of California

Edward A. Inferrera, et al. v. AmerUs Life Insurance Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2617

#### District of Kansas

Glen Studley, et al. v. American Investor Life Insurance Co., Inc., C.A. No. 5:05-4051

#### Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Walter B. Gilmour, et al. v. Barry O. Bohmueller, et al., C.A. No. 2:04-2535 Beryl Price, et al. v. AmerUs Group Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:04-3329 George J. Miller v. AmerUs Group Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:04-3799 Harcourt N. Trimble, III, etc. v. Brett B. Weinstein, et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2101 Richard Stein, et al. v. AmerUs Group Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2391

p. 7

## MDL-1713 -- In re Bank of America ATM Fee Litigation

Motion of defendant Bank of America, N.A., and plaintiffs Douglas S. Brown, Stephen Cawelti, and James A. Prosser for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts:

#### Central District of California

Stephen Cawelti v. Bank of America, N.A., C.A. No. 2:05-2680

#### District of Maryland

James A. Prosser v. Bank of America, N.A., C.A. No. 1:05-1134

#### District of Massachusetts

Douglas S. Brown v. Bank of America, N.A., C.A. No. 1:05-10713

#### MDL-1714 -- In re Rhodia S.A. Securities Litigation

Motion of plaintiff Oppenheim Pramerica Asset Management S.A.R.L. for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

## **District of New Jersey**

Bob Erickson v. Rhodia S.A., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-1890 Bernard Cerles v. Rhodia S.A., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2461 Angelo Emilio Albasio v. Rhodia S.A., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2753

#### Southern District of New York

Oppenheim Pramerica Asset Management S.A.R.L. v. Rhodia S.A., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-5389

p. 8

## MDL-1715 -- In re Ameriquest Mortgage Co. Mortgage Lending Practices Litigation

Motion of plaintiffs Cheryl Williams, et al., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Central District of California:

#### Central District of California

Adolph Peter Kurt Burggraff v. Ameriquest Capital Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:04-9715

#### Northern District of California

Nona Knox, et al. v. Ameriquest Mortgage Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-240

#### Middle District of Florida

Latonya Williams, et al. v. Ameriquest Mortgage Co., C.A. No. 8:05-1036

#### District of Massachusetts

Isabelle M. Murphy, et al. v. Ameriquest Mortgage Co., C.A. No. 1:04-12651

#### Southern District of New York

Cheryl Williams, et al. v. Ameriquest Mortgage Co., C.A. No. 1:05-6189

#### MDL-1716 -- In re OxyContin Products Liability Litigation (No. II)

Motion of plaintiffs in 27 of the following 30 actions for centralization of the actions in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois:

#### Eastern District of Arkansas

Michael R. Engle v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 4:04-602

## District of Arizona

Frank D. Marcum v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:04-1824

p. 9

MDL-1716 (Continued)

#### Central District of California

Shari J. Sanders v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:04-4665

#### Middle District of Florida

Daniel B. Timmons v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al., C.A. No. 8:04-1479

## Middle District of Georgia

Cornelia P. Taylor v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 5:04-197

#### Central District of Illinois

Michael J. Collins v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-3279 James E. Plowman v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-3280

## Southern District of Illinois

Robert G. Savant v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-394
Betty F. McKane v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-395
Marie L. Cavenaile v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-401
Cathy D. Wilken, et al. v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-402
Timothy Wilkes v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-403

#### Southern District of Iowa

Chelly Griffith v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-10072

#### District of Kansas

William J. Honeyman v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:04-2411

#### Eastern District of Kentucky

Jack P. Marcum v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:04-152 Phillip L. Crabtree v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 6:04-294

p. 10

MDL-1716 (Continued)

#### Western District of Louisiana

Enrique Angulo v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-1638

## Northern District of Mississippi

Gregory Suber, Sr. v. Purdue Pharma, L.P., et al., C.A. No. 4:03-97

## Southern District of Mississippi

Henry Butch Turner v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-403

## District of New Hampshire

Charlene E. Franz v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-201

#### Southern District of New York

Donald Pratt v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-2100 Linda Terry v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-2102

#### Southern District of Ohio

Judy Wethington, et al. v. Purdue Pharma LP, et al., C.A. No. 1:01-441 Victoria A. Cook v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-530

#### Eastern District of Texas

Cynthia A. McKnight v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 9:04-116

#### Northern District of Texas

Eric J. Koenig, et al. v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-1590 Charlie L. Lee, Jr. v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 3:04-1697

p. 11

MDL-1716 (Continued)

## Southern District of Texas

Michael R. Engle, et al. v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 4:04-2407

#### Eastern District of Wisconsin

Kay H. Freund v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-611 Teddy L. Farris v. Purdue Pharma Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:04-736

#### MDL-1717 -- In re Intel Corp. Microprocessor Antitrust Litigation

Motion of plaintiffs Michael Brauch, et al., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

#### Northern District of California

David E. Lipton, et al. v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2669
Maria I. Prohias v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2699
Ronald Konieczka v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2700
Patricia M. Niehaus v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2720
Steve J. Hamilton v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2721
Michael Brauch, et al. v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2743
Susan Baxley v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2758
Huston Frazier, et al. v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2813
Dwight E. Dickerson v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2818
The Harman Press v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 3:05-2823

#### District of Delaware

Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., et al. v. Intel Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-441 Jim Kidwell, et al. v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 1:05-470 Robert J. Rainwater, et al. v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 1:05-473 Matthew Kravitz, et al. v. Intel Corp., C.A. No. 1:05-476

p. 12

# MDL-1718 -- In re Ford Motor Co. Speed Control Deactivation Switch Products Liability Litigation

Motion of defendants Ford Motor Company; Karl Flammer Ford, Inc.; and Bill Currie Ford, Inc., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan:

## Middle District of Florida

Michael T. Iley, et al. v. Ford Motor Co., et al., C.A. No. 8:05-1139 Robert Nicholas Dill, Sr., et al. v. Ford Motor Co., et al., C.A. No. 8:05-1234

## Eastern District of Louisiana

Joseph T. Whittington v. Ford Motor Co., C.A. No. 2:05-2469

## Eastern District of Michigan

Marcus Ebow v. Ford Motor Co., C.A. No. 2:05-70781

#### Western District of Washington

Arlene J. Castrow, et al. v. Ford Motor Co., C.A. No. 3:05-5422

## MDL-1719 -- In re Owest Communications International, Inc., Securities & "ERISA" Litigation

Motion of defendants Citigroup Global Markets, Inc.; Sandy Weill; Jack Grubman; and Arthur Andersen LLP for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado:

#### <u>District of Colorado</u>

New England Health Care Employees Pension Fund v. Qwest Communications
International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:01-1451
Stanton Discount Pharmacy, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al.,
C.A. No. 1:01-1472

p. 13

#### MDL-1719 (Continued)

## District of Colorado (Continued)

Douglass Urquhart, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:01-1527

Tyler Del Valle Grady, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:01-1616

Robert Cline, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:01-1799

David Tanner, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:01-1930

Herbert S. Cohen Trust v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-333

Adele Brody, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-374

Valerie J. Brooks, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-464

Janice Dudley, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-470

Rod Coyle, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-482 Brian Barry v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-507 James Rooney, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al.,

C.A. No. 1:02-602

Laila Abdelnour v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-658

Paula Smith, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al.,

C.A. No. 1:02-714

Stuart Wollman v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-755 Seymour Tabacoff, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-798

Mary Stuhr v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:02-2120 Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-238

Shriners Hospitals for Children v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-781

Teachers' Retirement System of Louisiana v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-782

New York City Employees Retirement System, et al. v. Qwest Communications International, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-1964

p. 14

MDL-1719 (Continued)

#### Southern District of Florida

William M. Rogers, et al. v. Joseph P. Nacchio, et al., C.A. No. 0:05-60667

## MDL-1720 -- In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation

Motion of plaintiffs Rookies, Inc., et al., for centralization of certain of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California and motion of defendants Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., for centralization of the following actions in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia:

## Northern District of California

Rookies, Inc., et al. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-2933 Randall Jasperson v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-2996

#### District of Connecticut

Photos Etc. Corp., et al. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-1007 Tabu Salon & Spa, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-1111 East Goshen Pharmacy, Inc., etc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-1177

#### Northern District of Georgia

Animal Land, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., C.A. No. 1:05-1210

#### Southern District of New York

Nucity Publications, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-5991
Fairmont Orthopedics & Sports Medicine, PA, et al. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-6259
Parkway Corp., et al. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-6349
The Kroger Co., et al. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-6409

p. 15

MDL-1720 (Continued)

# Southern District of New York (Continued)

Baltimore Avenue Foods, LLC v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-6532 Broken Ground, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-6543 Lakeshore Interiors v. Visa U.S.A., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-6683 Bonte Wafflerie, LLC, et al. v. Visa U.S.A., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-6708

p. 16

# SECTION B MATTERS DESIGNATED FOR CONSIDERATION WITHOUT ORAL ARGUMENT

## MDL-875 -- In re Asbestos Products Liability Litigation (No. VI)

Oppositions of plaintiffs to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

#### Middle District of Florida

Linda Vaughn, etc. v. Borg-Warner Corp., et al., C.A. No. 8:05-978

#### Northern District of Florida

Ann Elizabeth Buchinger, etc. v. Garlock, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-118

#### District of Oregon

Howard Wood v. Allis-Chalmers Corp. Product Liability Trust, et al., C.A. No. 3:05-706

#### District of Utah

Audrey Fratto, etc. v. Asarco, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-336

#### Eastern District of Virginia

Mary E. Blackburn v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2895
Albert W. Dail, etc. v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2896
Frances C. Diggs v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2897
Mildred S. Edwards v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2898
Doris M. Harmon, etc. v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2899
Burnell Landrum v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2900
Sandra L. Russell, etc. v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2901
Robert Schaffer, Jr., etc. v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2902

p. 17

MDL-875 (Continued)

## Eastern District of Virginia (Continued)

Gladys I. Spikes v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2903
Peggy O. Sheets v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2904
Nonie C. White v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2905
Betty Jean Lancaster v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2906
Betty J. Williams v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2907
Crystal W. Moore, etc. v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2908
James T. Turner, etc. v. Northrup Grumman Newport News, C.A. No. 4:05-2909

## Southern District of West Virginia

Charles E. Hamrick, et al. v. A&I Co., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-286

Motion of claimants Jean Minas Baudoin and Claudette Nugier Baudoin for reconsideration of the Panel's ruling transferring the following action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

## Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Murphy Exploration & Production Co. v. McCarty Corp., et al. (E.D. Louisiana, C.A. No. 2:04-1554)

# MDL-1203 -- In re Diet Drugs (Phentermine/Fenfluramine/Dexfenfluramine) Products Liability Litigation

Opposition of defendant Wyeth to remand, under 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a), of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of Utah:

#### Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Patty Long v. American Home Products Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:03-20087 (D. Utah, C.A. No. 2:02-972)

p. 18

#### MDL-1285 -- In re Vitamin Antitrust Litigation

Motion of defendants Shijiazhuang Pharmaceutical (USA); China Pharmaceutical Group, Ltd.; and Hebei Welcome Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., for remand, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a), of the following action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York:

#### District of District of Columbia

Animal Science Products, Inc., et al. v. Hebei Welcome Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., et al. (E.D. New York, C.A. No. 1:05-453)

#### MDL-1334 -- In re Managed Care Litigation

Oppositions of plaintiffs James Mirabile, M.D., et al., and Dr. Steven Buie, et al., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida:

#### **District of Kansas**

James Mirabile, M.D., et al. v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Kansas City, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2223

#### Western District of Missouri

Dr. Steven Buie, et al. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas City, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-534

Motion of defendant Oxford Health Plans LLC for transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida:

#### District of New Jersey

John Ivan Sutter, M.D. v. Oxford Health Plans LLC, C.A. No. 2:05-2198

p. 19

## MDL-1335 -- In re Tyco International, Ltd., Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation

Opposition of plaintiff Scott Stevenson to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire:

#### Southern District of Florida

Scott Stevenson v. Tyco International, Ltd., et al., C.A. No. 9:05-80375

## MDL-1348 -- In re Rezulin Products Liability Litigation

Opposition of plaintiff Steven Camargo to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

## Eastern District of California

Steven Camargo v. Warner-Lambert Co., LLC, et al., C.A. No. 1:05-533

#### MDL-1358 -- In re Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether ("MTBE") Products Liability Litigation

Opposition of plaintiff City of Merced to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

#### Eastern District of California

City of Merced v. Exxon Mobil Corp., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-662

p. 20

## MDL-1507 -- In re Prempro Products Liability Litigation

Oppositions of plaintiffs Ursula Bryan, et al., and defendants Harold H. Shlevin, Ph.D., and Solvay Pharmaceuticals, Inc., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas:

## Eastern District of Missouri

Ursula Bryan, et al. v. Wyeth, et al., C.A. No. 4:05-607

#### Western District of Tennessee

Cheryl Autin, et al. v. Solvay Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2213

## MDL-1513 -- In re Wireless Telephone Services Antitrust Litigation

Opposition of plaintiffs Jessica McClain, et al., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

#### Western District of Tennessee

Jessica McClain, et al. v. Sprint Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-2229

# MDL-1562 -- In re General Motors Corp. Dex-Cool Products Liability Litigation

Opposition of plaintiff Anthony Natale, Jr., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois:

#### **District of Massachusetts**

Anthony Natale, Jr. v. General Motors Corp., C.A. No. 1:05-11152

Motion of defendant General Motors Corporation for transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois:

p. 21

MDL-1562 (Continued)

#### Eastern District of California

Jason Bertino, et al. v. General Motors Corp., C.A. No. 2:05-889

## MDL-1566 -- In re Western States Wholesale Natural Gas Antitrust Litigation

Opposition of plaintiff Multiut Corporation to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of Nevada:

#### Northern District of Illinois

Multiut Corp. v. Dynegy, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:04-8283

## MDL-1574 -- In re Paxil Products Liability Litigation

Opposition of plaintiff Linda Van Dyke, etc., and defendant SmithKline Beecham Corporation to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Central District of California:

#### **District of Wyoming**

Linda Van Dyke, etc. v. GlaxoSmithKline, C.A. No. 2:05-153

## MDL-1586 -- In re Mutual Funds Investment Litigation

Oppositions of plaintiffs Lydia Maxwell; David Rothschild; and Darrell V. McGraw, Jr., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland:

#### Central District of California

Lydia Maxwell v. PIMCO Funds Multi-Manager Series, C.A. No. 8:05-479

p. 22

MDL-1586 (Continued)

## Western District of Pennsylvania

David Rothschild v. Federated American Leaders Fund, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-896

## Northern District of West Virginia

Darrell V. McGraw, Jr. v. Aim Advisors, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 5:05-78

## MDL-1598 -- In re Ephedra Products Liability Litigation

Oppositions of plaintiffs Murray J. Eaves and Lesley Johnston, et al., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

#### District of Minnesota

Murray J. Eaves v. Muscletech Research & Development, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 0:05-978

#### Western District of Missouri

Lesley Johnston, et al. v. Physical FX, L.C., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-575

#### MDL-1604 -- In re Ocwen Federal Bank FSB Mortgage Servicing Litigation

Opposition of plaintiffs Roy Capers and Cheryle Williams to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

#### Southern District of Alabama

Roy Capers v. Ocwen Federal Bank, FSB, C.A. No. 1:05-233 Cheryle Williams v. Ocwen Federal Bank, FSB, C.A. No. 2:05-234

p. 23

## MDL-1610 -- In re Conseco Life Insurance Co. Cost of Insurance Litigation

Opposition of plaintiffs Sidney Bark, et al., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Central District of California:

## Northern District of Illinois

Sidney Bark, et al. v. Conseco Life Insurance Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-3488

## MDL-1629 -- In re Neurontin Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation

Oppositions of plaintiffs Gerald Demers and Teresa E. Teater to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts:

#### District of Maine

Gerald Demers v. Pfizer, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-84

#### District of Oregon

Teresa E. Teater v. Pfizer, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-604

#### MDL-1657 -- In re Vioxx Products Liability Litigation

Oppositions of plaintiffs and defendants Walgreen Company and Dario Arango, M.D., to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana:

#### Eastern District of California

John Martin v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-750

### Southern District of California

Alvin Williams v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-943 Margaret Stein v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-944 Otis Anderson v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-945

p. 24

MDL-1657 (Continued)

## Southern District of California (Continued)

Joan Ongley v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-947
Hilda Armenta v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-948
Robert Levesque v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-949
Clancy Lucille Holloway v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-950
Laura Martinez v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-951
Clarice Forbes v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-953
Robert Castro v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-954
Joseph Capozzi v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-957
Anna Lemmons v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-958
Richard Brown v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-959
Aida Hernandez v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-961
Robert Scott v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-962
Violet Abramson v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-963
Carmen Esquer v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-964

#### District of Colorado

Estella M. Remington v. Walgreen Co., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-892

#### Southern District of Illinois

Rosie-May Spann v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-315

James Steele, Jr., et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-339

Greg Miller, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-361

Wilma Gaston, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-362

Ralph Rabe, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-363

John Allen, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-377

Joyce Morgan, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-378

#### Western District of Kentucky

William Andrew Curl, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-324
Brenda Cox, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-332
Patrick Wayne Overall, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-333
James Goodman v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-334
Steven Clark v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:05-335

p. 25

Page 27 of 32

MDL-1657 (Continued)

## Eastern District of Missouri

Dorothy Ganser, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-557
Letty Bess, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-568
Arthur Mullins, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-569
Dorothy Kassing, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-631
Shirley Zook, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-632
Andrew Kisty, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-665
Virginia Kell, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-666
Mary Benson, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-668
Earlie Douglas, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-671
Loretta Trinidad, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-673
David Moultrie, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-674
Irene Rogers, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-675
Charlotte Bohlke, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 4:05-837

#### District of Nevada

Terry L. Grove, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-598 James Conroy, et al. v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-629

#### Middle District of North Carolina

Jimmy Reid v. Merck & Co., Inc., C.A. No. 1:05-348

#### Eastern District of Texas

Elfriede Blacketer v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-336 Walter Maddox v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:05-338

#### Southern District of Texas

Santos Villarreal Layton v. Dario Arango, M.D., et al., C.A. No. 7:05-149

p. 26

MDL-1657 (Continued)

## Western District of Washington

Robert K. Waitt v. Merck & Co., Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:05-759

#### Northern District of West Virginia

Shelia Dalgo v. Merck & Co., Inc., C.A. No. 5:05-48

## MDL-1663 -- In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation

Oppositions of plaintiffs Palm Tree Computers Systems, Inc., et al., and KLLM, Inc., and defendants The Chubb Corporation, CIGNA Corporation, and Life Insurance Company of North America to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey:

#### Southern District of California

Ronald Scott Shirley, et al. v. Universal Life Resources, et al., C.A. No. 3:04-2102

#### Middle District of Florida

Palm Tree Computers Systems, Inc., et al. v. Ace USA, et al., C.A. No. 6:05-422

#### Southern District of Mississippi

KLLM, Inc. v. Marsh USA, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:03-1294

p. 27

## MDL-1665 -- In re Acacia Media Technologies Corp. Patent Litigation

Oppositions of defendants CSC Holdings, Inc.; Time Warner Cable, Inc.; and Bresnan Communications, LLC, to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

# Eastern District of New York

Acacia Media Technologies Corp. v. CSC Holdings, Inc., C.A. No. 2:05-2036

## Southern District of New York

Acacia Media Technologies Corp. v. Time Warner Cable, et al., C.A. No. 1:05-4148

# PROCEDURES FOR ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

All oral argument is governed by the provisions of Rule 16.1 of the <u>Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation</u> (effective April 2, 2001). Rule 16.1(g) allows a maximum of twenty minutes for oral argument in each matter. In most cases, however, less time is necessary for the expression of all views and the Panel reserves the prerogative of reducing the time requested by counsel. Accordingly, counsel should be careful not to overstate the time requested for oral argument.

The Panel insists that counsel limit all oral argument to the appropriate criteria. See generally In re "East of the Rockies" Concrete Pipe Antitrust Cases, 302 F. Supp. 244, 255-56 (J.P.M.L. 1969) (concurring opinion) (discussion concerning criteria for transfer).

Rule 16.1 is duplicated in its entirety hereafter for your convenience.

#### RULE 16.1: HEARING SESSIONS AND ORAL ARGUMENT

- (a) Hearing sessions of the Panel for the presentation of oral argument and consideration of matters taken under submission without oral argument shall be held as ordered by the Panel. The Panel shall convene whenever and wherever desirable or necessary in the judgment of the Chairman. The Chairman shall determine which matters shall be considered at each hearing session and the Clerk of the Panel shall give notice to counsel for all parties involved in the litigation to be so considered of the time, place and subject matter of such hearing session.
- (b) Each party filing a motion or a response to a motion or order of the Panel under Rules 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 or 7.6 of these Rules may file simultaneously therewith a separate statement limited to one page setting forth reasons why oral argument should, or need not, be heard. Such statements shall be captioned "Reasons Why Oral Argument Should [Need Not] Be Heard," and shall be filed and served in conformity with Rules 5.12 and 5.2 of these Rules.
- (c) No transfer or remand determination regarding any action pending in the district court shall be made by the Panel when any party timely opposes such transfer or remand unless a hearing session has been held for the presentation of oral argument except that the Panel may dispense with oral argument if it determines that:
  - (i) the dispositive issue(s) have been authoritatively decided; or
- (ii) the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented in the briefs and record, and the decisional process would not be significantly aided by oral argument.

  Unless otherwise ordered by the Panel, all other matters before the Panel, such as a motion for reconsideration, shall be considered and determined upon the basis of the papers filed.
- (d) In those matters in which oral argument is not scheduled by the Panel, counsel shall be promptly advised. If oral argument is scheduled in a matter the Clerk of the Panel may require counsel for all parties who wish to make or to waive oral argument to file and serve notice to that effect within a stated time in conformity with Rules 5.12 and 5.2 of these Rules. Failure to do so shall be deemed a waiver of oral argument by that party. If oral argument is scheduled but not attended by a party, the matter shall not be rescheduled and that party's position shall be treated as submitted for decision by the Panel on the basis of the papers filed.
- (e) Except for leave of the Panel on a showing of good cause, only those parties to actions scheduled for oral argument who have filed a motion or written response to a motion or order shall be permitted to appear before the Panel and present oral argument.
- (f) Counsel for those supporting transfer or remand under Section 1407 and counsel for those opposing such transfer or remand are to confer separately prior to the oral argument for the purpose of organizing their arguments and selecting representatives to present all views without duplication.
- (g) Unless otherwise ordered by the Panel, a maximum of twenty minutes shall be allotted for oral argument in each matter. The time shall be divided equally among those with varying viewpoints. Counsel for the moving party or parties shall generally be heard first.

- So far as practicable and consistent with the purposes of Section 1407, the offering of oral testimony before the Panel shall be avoided. Accordingly, oral testimony shall not be received except upon notice, motion and order of the Panel expressly providing for it.
- After an action or group of actions has been set for a hearing session, consideration of such action(s) may be continued only by order of the Panel on good cause shown.